

**SAO**

Jonathan B. Lee, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 13524

**RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM**

801 South Fourth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 444-4444

Fax: (702) 444-4455

Email: jlee@richardharrislaw.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MACK MILLER, an individual;

Plaintiff,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, a political  
subdivision; DOE CLARK COUNTY  
OFFICERS, in their personal capacities; DOE  
PRIVATE SECURITY GUARDS, in their  
personal capacities; PREVENTIVE  
MEASURES SECURITY FIRM, LLC, a  
domestic limited liability company; MARCO  
SOLORIO, individually; LEONARD MORRIS,  
individually; ROE PRIVATE SECURITY  
COMPANY; DOES 1 through 20; ROE  
BUSINESS ENTITIES 1 through 20, inclusive  
jointly and severally,

Defendants.

CLARK COUNTY, a Political Subdivision of  
State of Nevada,

Cross-claimant,

vs.

PREVENTIVE MEASURES SECURITY  
FIRM, LLC, a domestic limited liability  
company.

Cross-defendant,

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-00070-CDS-DJA

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO  
EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES**

**(Second Request)**

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties hereto, by and  
through their respective counsel that the discovery deadlines shall be extended in this matter.

**I. DISCOVERY COMPLETED TO DATE**

The parties have participated in the following discovery to date:

1. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;
2. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;
3. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental disclosures;
4. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures;
5. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Fourth Supplemental disclosures;
6. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Fifth Supplemental disclosures;
7. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Sixth Supplemental disclosures;
8. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Seventh Supplemental disclosures;
9. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Eighth Supplemental disclosures;
10. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;
11. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;
12. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental disclosures;
13. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures;
14. Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;
15. Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;
16. Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental disclosures;
17. Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures;
18. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Preventive Measures;
19. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Preventive Measures;
20. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories to Preventive Measures;
21. Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Admissions;
22. Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Set





1 of Requests for Production of Documents;

2 23. Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Set  
3 of Interrogatories;

4 24. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff;

5 25. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Plaintiff;

6 26. Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to  
7 Plaintiff;

8 27. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for  
9 Admissions;

10 28. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for  
11 Production of Documents;

12 29. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories;

13 30. Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff;

14 31. Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Requests for Admissions to Plaintiff;

15 32. Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Requests for Production of Documents  
16 to Plaintiff;

17 33. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of Requests for  
18 Admissions;

19 34. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of Requests for  
20 Production of Documents;

21 35. Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of  
22 Interrogatories;

23 36. Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Preventive Measures;

24 37. Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Preventive Measures;

25 38. Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production to Defendant Preventive Measures;

26 39. Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Clark County;

27 40. Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Clark County;

28 41. Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production to Defendant Clark County;



42. Defendant Preventive Measures' Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Preventive Measures;

43. Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Clark County;

44. Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Clark County;

45. Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production to Defendant Clark County;

46. Defendant Preventive Measures' Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production; and

## **II. DISCOVERY REMAINING TO BE COMPLETED**

1. Deposition of Plaintiff (currently scheduled for February 21, 2024);

2. Deposition of Kate Murray (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);

3. Deposition of Brian Cooperman (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);

4. Deposition of Elando Johnson (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);

5. Deposition of newly added Defendant Marco Solorio;

6. Deposition of newly added Defendant Leonard Morris;

7. Deposition of David Sutton (current or former employee of Defendant Preventative Measures);

8. Depositions of other fact witnesses present at the County Commission meeting during the subject incident;

9. Supplemental FRCP 26 disclosures;

10. Expert disclosures;

11. Deposition of parties' treating physicians and/or experts;

12. Any additional discovery that is necessary as the parties proceed through discovery.

## **III. REASONS WHY DISCOVERY NOT COMPLETED WITHIN TIME SET BY DISCOVERY PLAN**

A motion to extend deadlines articulated in the court's scheduling order must be supported by a showing of good cause. *See* Local Rule 26-3; *see also Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*,



1 975 F.2d 604, 608-09 (9th Cir. 1992). Good cause to extend a deadline exists if it cannot reasonably  
2 be met despite the diligence of the party seeking extension. *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609. In the instant  
3 matter, all parties have diligently attempted to comply with the Court’s scheduling order –  
4 however, the parties have determined they will be unable to obtain unable to obtain and produce  
5 key evidence related to the incident and alleged damages, which then deprives the parties and their  
6 respective experts of access to all evidence to formulate their opinions, complete their evaluations  
7 and prepare their reports accordingly, as well as impairs counsels ability to reach a proper  
8 determination as to further discovery needed. A few procedural issues have been pending that have  
9 influenced the parties’ ability to conduct the necessary discovery in this matter:

10 1. Mr. Miller was recently incarcerated and is currently an inmate at Southern Desert  
11 Correctional Center. On October 2, 2023, Defendant Clark County filed a motion for leave to take  
12 Mr. Miller’s deposition. *See* ECF Doc. 14. Plaintiff’s counsel filed a notice of non-opposition on  
13 October 18, 2023. *See* ECF Doc. 24. **On January 2, 2024, the Court granted Defendant Clark**  
14 **County’s Motion to take Plaintiff’s deposition. *See* ECF Doc. 33. The parties have already**  
15 **coordinated with Southern Desert Correctional Center to conduct Plaintiff’s in-person**  
16 **deposition on February 21, 2024.**

17 2. On October 10, 2023, the Court issued an order granting Mr. Miller’s request to amend  
18 his complaint to add Defendants Marco Solorio and Leonard Morris. *See* ECF Doc. 15. Mr. Miller  
19 subsequently filed the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) the following day. *See* ECF Doc. 17.  
20 Service of the first amended complaint and summonses has been complete. Defendant Solorio and  
21 Morris recently filed an answer to the FAC on January 11, 2024. *See* ECF Doc. 35 and 36.

22 3. On October 16, 2023, Defendant Clark County moved to amend the Crossclaim that it  
23 asserted against Defendant Preventative Measures. *See* ECF Doc. 19. **On January 2, 2024, the**  
24 **Court also granted Defendant Clark County’s motion to amend the cross claim that it**  
25 **asserted against Defendant Preventative Measures. *See* ECF Doc. 33. Defendant/Cross**  
26 **claimant Clark County subsequently filed its amended cross claim on January 10, 2024. *See***  
27 **ECF Doc. 34. Defendant/Cross defendant Preventative Measures has yet to respond**  
28 **Defendant/Cross claimant Clark County’s amended cross claim.**

1           **4. On October 24, 2023, Plaintiff conferred with counsel for the Defendants via email**  
2 **about the deposition availability of the following current or former employees of the**  
3 **Defendants: Elando Johnson (Clark County employee), Katie Murray (Clark County**  
4 **employee), Brian Copperman (Clark County employee), Jon Kitchen (Preventative**  
5 **Measures employee), and David Sutton (Preventative Measures employee). Since Plaintiff's**  
6 **inquiry regarding these depositions, Defense counsel has diligently attempted to locate/**  
7 **coordinate the availability of these current/former employees. Recently, the parties were able**  
8 **to set the depositions Elando Johnson (Clark County employee), Katie Murray (Clark**  
9 **County employee), Brian Copperman (Clark County employee) – which are all scheduled**  
10 **for February 15, 2024. The parties are still trying to coordinate the deposition availability**  
11 **Jon Kitchen (Preventative Measures employee), David Sutton (Preventative Measures**  
12 **employee) along with the newly added defendants, Marco Solorio and Leonard Morris.**  
13 **however, with little success.**

14           **5. Lastly, counsel for Defendant Preventative Measures has a firm trial setting**  
15 **through mid-February 2024.**

16           In sum, the parties cannot meet the expert deadline and complete discovery within the  
17 current dates due to the reasons above. The parties believe that the depositions of Mr. Miller and  
18 the current and former employees of Clark County and Preventative Measures are critical to the  
19 opinions of the parties' liability experts in this matter and, out of an abundance of caution, the  
20 parties seek the requested extension to ensure that there is sufficient time to locate these  
21 employees, set their respective depositions, and to allow the parties' expert witnesses to a fair  
22 opportunity to consider these individuals' testimony so that they can formulating their expert  
23 opinions. Equally important, the parties are also engaging in attempts to resolve this matter before  
24 expending more time and resources on discovery. Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that  
25 the discovery deadlines in this matter be extended by an additional ninety (90) days. requested  
26 extension will ensure all parties have a full and fair opportunity to litigate the claims and defenses  
27 on the merits. Therefore, and as set forth below, due diligence and good cause can be shown to  
28 allow the Court, in its discretion, to extend the remaining deadlines as requested.



**IV. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETING DISCOVERY**

Based on the foregoing, the proposed schedule for completing discovery is as follows:

Discovery Deadline	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Motion to Amend/Add Parties	No extension	No extension
Plaintiff's Initial Expert Disclosures	02.12.2024	05.13.2024
All Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	03.12.2024	06.10.2024
Discovery Cut-Off Date	04.11.2024	07.10.2024
Dispositive Motions	05.13.2024	08.12.2024

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2024.  
**RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM**

*/s/ Jonathan B. Lee*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Jonathan B. Lee, Esq.  
 Nevada Bar Number 13524  
 801 South Fourth Street  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2024.  
**CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY**

*/s/ Joel K. Browning*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Joel K. Browning, Esq.  
 Nevada Bar No. 14489  
 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Suite 5075  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155  
*Attorneys for Defendant, Clark County*

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2024.  
**TYSON & MENDES**

*/s/ Russell D. Christian*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Russell D. Christian, Esq.  
 Nevada Bar No. 11785  
 2835 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 140  
 Henderson, Nevada 89052  
*Attorneys for Defendant,  
 Preventive Measures Security Firm, LLC*

**ORDER**

**IT IS SO ORDERED subject to the following modification.** The parties' proposed schedule fails to include a deadline for filing their joint pretrial order. Accordingly, the deadline to file the Joint Pretrial Order is **September 11, 2024**. If dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be suspended until 30 days after decision on the dispositive motions or further court order.

DATED this 31st day of January 2024.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS  
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE